

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of

Second Application by BellSouth
Corporation, BellSouth
Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth
Long Distance, Inc. for
Provision of In-Region, InterLATA
Services in Louisiana

)
) CC Docket No. 98-121
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

AFFIDAVIT

OF

ROBERT V. FALCONE

ON BEHALF OF

AT&T CORP.

AT&T EXHIBIT E

FCC DOCKET NO. 98-121
AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT V. FALCONE

certain conditions -- conditions that are remarkably vague in their application and that may not hold true once the numerous CLECs that have expressed interest in combining UNEs begin to request space. Finally, there is reason to doubt BellSouth's ability to meet these intervals: BellSouth has only limited actual experience in providing collocation and virtually no experience providing collocation that will be used to combine UNEs. To date, that experience shows that BellSouth has in fact been unable to provide collocated space in a timely manner, undercutting the reliability of BellSouth's inadequate paper commitments.

76. As to BellSouth's paper commitments for the inquiry phase of virtual and physical collocation, BellSouth claims that it will "respon[d] to individual Virtual Collocation Application Inquiries within 20 business days from receipt . . . and individual Physical Collocation Application Inquiries within 30 business days from receipt." Tipton Aff. ¶ 21 (emphasis added). Two points can be made about these intervals. First, because the intervals are measured in business days, the actual calendar response time will be nearly 30 calendar days for virtual collocation applications and over 40 calendar days for physical collocation applications. Typically, the "[r]equesting collocators will have 30 calendar days to review BellSouth's written response . . . and submit a complete and accurate Firm Order." Tipton Aff. ¶ 24 (emphasis added). Accordingly, if everything follows the plan, the entire inquiry phase for each single request will take nearly two months for virtual collocation and about ten weeks for physical collocation.

77. Second, as BellSouth's Master Collocation Agreement makes clear, the response intervals apply only to a maximum of "three applications for space within the same

FCC DOCKET NO. 98-121
AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT V. FALCONE

state submitted within a fifteen business day interval. . . .When [a CLEC] submits more than three applications in the same state within 15 business days and BellSouth is processing multiple applications from other Interconnectors, BellSouth and [the CLEC] will negotiate in good faith a prioritization of the requests and a reasonable response time frame." Master Collocation Agreement, § 4.1.1, Tipton Aff., PAT Exh. 1 (emphasis added). With approximately 20 business days per month, a CLEC could expect that BellSouth could process a maximum of 12 applications every three months while still maintaining the promised response intervals. In Louisiana, there are more than 200 locations (including central offices and remote switching locations) at which collocated space would be needed in order to compete for all of BellSouth's customers. Thus, if on August 1, 1998, AT&T began submitting in Louisiana three applications every 15 business days, BellSouth would complete the final set of responses some 50 months later, in about October, 2002. As this figure shows, even BellSouth's paper commitments for the response times for physical and virtual collocation place significant delays on CLEC market entry via combined UNEs.

78. Turning to BellSouth's paper commitments for the construction and installation phase, these promised intervals likewise provide for significant delay. First, I note that BellSouth provides no intervals for the second phase of virtual collocation, i.e., the time period for BellSouth to take control of the CLECs' equipment, to install it, to complete all the pre-wiring, and to begin the first cut-overs. Presumably, since a separate cage need not be constructed in the central office, a CLEC might expect the interval for virtual collocation to be shorter than for physical. However, BellSouth does not provide any data

FCC DOCKET NO. 98-121
AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT V. FALCONE

collocation process for any one central office, from the date of the request until service can actually be provided, will last from six to eight months.

82. Of course, this scenario represents only BellSouth's paper commitments for physical collocation intervals. When it rejected BellSouth's collocation offer in South Carolina, the Commission recognized that estimates for collocation intervals should be reinforced by data showing the actual practices. See BellSouth South Carolina Order ¶ 203 ("Our concern with BellSouth's failure to commit in the SGAT to provisioning collocation within a definite interval is heightened by BellSouth's failure to demonstrate that it is in fact offering collocation in a timely manner."). The BellSouth intervals are likely more optimistic than what could be expected to occur in practice, under competitive conditions in which numerous CLECs will be seeking collocated space. In fact, BellSouth itself admits that the intervals it promises would not in fact apply if even one CLEC requested construction of space in every central office.²² In testimony before the South Carolina Public Service Commission, a BellSouth witness conceded that BellSouth did not have the capability to build collocated space in every central office simultaneously, and that such requests "would probably indeed cause a big bogdown." Id.

²² Attachment 17, Excerpts of Testimony of D. Redmond (BellSouth), South Carolina Public Service Commission, Proceeding to Review BellSouth's Cost Studies for Network Elements, Docket 97-374-C, Vol. III, Dec. 17, 1997, at 63-64 ("Redmond South Carolina Testimony") (responding affirmatively when asked whether BellSouth's intervals for providing collocated space would "get worse if a CLEC came in and said I need collocation [sic] space in every central office in the state."). And, this testimony applied to South Carolina, which has 100 central offices, one-half of the offices of Louisiana. See id.

FCC DOCKET NO. 98-121
AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT V. FALCONE

83. These delays in providing space are not limited to BellSouth, but apply to other RBOCs, and seemingly are inherent in collocation. For example, Bell Atlantic-New York ("BA-NY") recently testified before the New York Public Service Commission that there are significant limits to the number of collocation requests that it can handle at any one time. Although there are more than 500 central office and remote switch locations in BA-NY's territory, BA-NY claims to be able to handle only 15-20 collocation requests per month statewide, and no more than 8 applications total per month in any one of its five designated geographic regions within the state.²³ That witness also admitted that a request from just one CLEC for collocation in all 522 central offices in New York "will cause an inability to meet the demands" for over "two years" and "will cause chaos." Hearing Transcript, NY PSC Docket No. 97-C-0271, Maguire Testimony, Tr. 303. Accordingly, these paper commitments must be viewed with considerable suspicion.

84. And in Louisiana, BellSouth simply does not have enough experience to provide confidence in its estimated intervals. To date, BellSouth has completed at most only three physical collocation arrangements and six virtual collocation arrangements in Louisiana. Milner Aff. ¶ 27. Indeed, the information provided by BellSouth on these few arrangements is both incomplete and internally inconsistent, making it impossible to draw

²³ Affidavit of Karen Maguire, Petition of New York Telephone Company for Approval of its Statement of Generally Available Terms and Condition Pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Draft Filing of Petition for InterLATA Entry Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, NY PSC, Docket No. 97-C-0271, ¶ 20 ("Maguire Aff.") (excerpt attached as Attachment 18).

FCC DOCKET NO. 98-121
AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT V. FALCONE

costs in other contexts or to the states that have capped space preparation fees at a fixed rate.³³

130. BellSouth also argues that it need not provide a fixed price for space preparation because CLECs "may obtain appropriately redacted records regarding similar Louisiana collocation that was priced on an ICB basis." Br. at 35. But this, too, dodges the issue. The limited collocation activity in Louisiana provides no track record for estimating ICB costs. And even if it did, that is simply another reason why BellSouth, and not CLECs, should be required to commit to a figure and stand by it.

131. Specific rates for space preparation fees are vital because space preparation is a major category of "up-front" costs for which existing ILEC rates and proposals vary wildly. This is amply demonstrated by TCG's experience with BellSouth's space preparation fees in Georgia, which were supposedly capped at \$100/sq. ft. See TCG Georgia PSC Collocation Complaint, at 2-12 (Attachment 2). In response to TCG's request for 200 square feet of collocated space in each of three central offices in Georgia, BellSouth quoted space preparation fees of \$139,369, \$81,401, and \$92,690, resulting in rates for space preparation of \$697/sq. ft, \$407/sq. ft., and \$463/sq. ft. Id. at 16.³⁴ Moreover, a BellSouth

³³ See, e.g., Georgia Public Service Commission, Order, In re Review of Cost Studies, Methodologies, and Cost-Based Rates for Interconnection and Unbundling of BellSouth Telecommunications Services, Docket No. 7061-U, at 62, (Dec. 16, 1997) (capping space preparation fees at \$100 per square foot, and recognizing that an ICB rate is "an obstacle to competition because it introduces unnecessary uncertainty into the process").

³⁴ TCG was also charged an excessive rate for space construction in one of the three central
(continued...)

FCC DOCKET NO. 98-121
AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT V. FALCONE

witness testified in South Carolina that "the range" for space preparation costs "would be tremendous," and while "not unlimited," it could be "cost prohibitive even."³⁵ As these experiences show, space preparation fees can be very significant and very unpredictable, which makes precise rates all the more essential.

E. A Collocation Requirement Imposes Additional Difficulties for CLECs Seeking To Combine The Switch and Dedicated Transport or The Loop and Dedicated Transport

132. Although my affidavit concentrates on the problems that a collocation requirement imposes upon recombining the loop and the switching elements, BellSouth's collocation policy would also hinder CLECs attempting to combine other network elements. The first such combination involves the unbundled switching element and dedicated transport. Under this scenario, a CLEC may want to purchase the switching elements combined with dedicated transport in order to send its customer's calls to, for example, its OS/DA platform. BellSouth does not describe the terms and conditions for such a combination, but it seems that it will require a CLEC to collocate equipment in the central office, and then combine the switching element with the dedicated transport. In its brief

³⁴ (...continued)

offices. The total of BellSouth's charges in the three offices only for space preparation and space construction exceeded \$390,000, even though the Georgia PSC had set rates that, if BellSouth had not ignored them, would have totaled to \$87,000 for the three offices. As I understand, the complaint was later withdrawn after BellSouth admitted that the rates it proposed were inconsistent with the Georgia PSC's order and the TCG Interconnection Agreement.

³⁵ Redmond South Carolina Testimony, at 65-66 (Excerpt included as Attachment 17).

ATTACHMENT 4

- 1 A. FROM THE TIME THEY SAID WE OPPORTUNITY
2 ACTUALLY WANT THIS SPACE?
- 3 Q. EXACTLY.
- 4 A. OKAY. THAT COULD RANGE ANYWHERE FROM
5 PROBABLY IN A VERY, VERY BEST CASE, 45 DAYS
6 TO GOSH, IT COULD TAKE 180 DAYS OR MORE.
- 7 Q. SIX MONTHS?
- 8 A. UH-HUH.
- 9 Q. SO A BRACKET BETWEEN A MONTH AND-A-HALF AND
10 SIX MONTHS ROUGHLY?
- 11 A. YES. UNLESS THERE WOULD BE EXTENUATING
12 CIRCUMSTANCES. SOMETHING HOLDING YOU UP.
- 13 Q. WOULD THAT RANGE YOU THINK GET WORSE IF A
14 CLEC CAME IN AND SAID I NEED COLOCATION
15 SPACE IN EVERY CENTRAL OFFICE IN THE STATE?
- 16 A. YES.
- 17 Q. THE TIME LINE WOULD PROBABLY GET A LOT MORE
18 DON'T YOU THINK?
- 19 A. YES.
- 20 Q. DO YOU KNOW DOES BELLSOUTH HAVE THE
21 CAPABILITY TO BE ABLE TO BUILD COLOCATION
22 SPACE IN EVERY CENTRAL OFFICE IN THE STATE
23 LIKE SIMULTANEOUSLY?
- 24 A. DO WE HAVE -- I'M SORRY. REPHRASE THAT.
- 25 Q. DO YOU HAVE SUFFICIENT CAPABILITY TO BUILD

1 COLOCATION SPACE IN EVERY CENTRAL OFFICE IN
2 SOUTH CAROLINA SIMULTANEOUSLY?

3 A. GIVEN THAT THERE IS SPACE?

4 Q. I'M SORRY. WHAT?

5 A. GIVEN THAT THERE IS SPACE IN THE CENTRAL
6 OFFICES?

7 Q. YES.

8 A. THAT WOULD PROBABLY INDEED CAUSE A BIG
9 BOGDOWN. WE COULD DO IT THROUGH THE USE OF
10 ARCHITECTS THAT WE HAVE IN THE AREA.

11 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA HOW LONG IT MIGHT
12 TAKE?

13 A. GOSH, IN THAT INSTANCE, I COULDN'T, BECAUSE
14 THERE ARE OVER 100 CENTRAL OFFICES IN SOUTH
15 CAROLINA.

16 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE COSTS THAT
17 BELLSOUTH HAS CALCULATED ITS COST STUDY FOR
18 COLOCATION?

19 A. I AM SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR WITH THOSE.

20 Q. AS I LOOK AT THEM, THERE ARE THREE MAJOR
21 COSTS. THERE IS THE APPLICATION COST, THE
22 CABLE INSTALLATION COST AND THE SPACE
23 PREPARATION COST. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME
24 THAT THOSE ARE THE THREE BIG DRIVERS?

25 A. AS FAR AS I KNOW. I'M NOT REAL FAMILIAR

1 WITH ALL OF THE COST ELEMENTS.

2 Q. WELL WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU IS IN MR.
3 VARNER'S TESTIMONY, ON HIS ATTACHMENT, THE
4 COST LISTED FOR SPACE PREPARATION IS ICB,
5 INDIVIDUAL CASE BASIS?

6 A. CORRECT.

7 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA ON AVERAGE, ON AN
8 AVERAGE CENTRAL OFFICE HOW MUCH IT WOULD
9 COST FOR SPACE PREPARATION IN THE CENTRAL
10 OFFICE?

11 A. THERE IS NO ANSWER TO THAT. THAT IS TRULY
12 WHY IT IS AN ICB. YOU COULD GO TO ONE
13 CENTRAL OFFICE, AND YOU MIGHT EVEN HAVE A
14 ROOM THAT'S EXISTING SITTING RIGHT THERE
15 THAT YOU COULD USE A VERY MINIMAL WORK. ON
16 THE OTHER HAND, YOU MIGHT HAVE A CONVOLUTED
17 PATH TO GET TO ANY SPACE ANYWHERE IN THE
18 CENTRAL OFFICE OR YOU MIGHT HAVE TO REMOVE
19 ASBESTOS OR YOU MIGHT HAVE TO DO ANY NUMBER
20 OF THINGS THAT COULD -- THE RANGE WOULD BE
21 TREMENDOUS.

22 Q. IS THERE A TYPICAL CENTRAL OFFICE SPACE?

23 A. NO.

24 Q. IS THAT WHY YOU CAN'T GIVE ME AN AVERAGE?

25 A. CORRECT.

- 1 Q. CAN YOU GIVE ME A RANGE FROM THE EASIEST
2 CENTRAL OFFICE TO THE MOST EXPENSIVE
3 CENTRAL OFFICE FOR COLOCATION PURPOSES?
4 A. AND THAT WOULD BE FOR -- NO. I REALLY
5 CAN'T.
6 Q. AND I GUESS I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT.
7 COULD IT GO UP TO SAY \$100,000 FOR SPACE
8 PREPARATION?
9 A. OH, YES.
10 Q. COULD IT BE MORE?
11 A. SURE.
12 Q. IT'S JUST HARD TO PREDETECT SITTING HERE
13 TODAY WHAT IT WOULD BE?
14 A. IT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO PREDICT WHAT IT
15 WOULD BE, BECAUSE THE, AS I SAY, THE AGE OF
16 SOME OF THESE FACILITIES, YOU HAVE NO IDEA
17 WHAT YOU'RE REALLY GETTING INTO. AND IT
18 COULD BE SO CONVOLUTED AND SO MUCH WORK
19 THAT YOU HAVE TO DO THAT IT'S AN UNLIMITED
20 -- WELL IT'S NOT UNLIMITED CERTAINLY --
21 BUT IT WOULD BE A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF
22 MONEY. I WOULD IMAGINE THAT A CERTAIN
23 POINT THAT IT WOULD BE COST PROHIBITIVE
24 EVEN.
25 Q. DO YOU KNOW FOR PURPOSES OF ITS COST STUDY

ATTACHMENT 5

State of New York
Department of Public Service

Bell Atlantic OSS Evaluation Project

Final Report

DRAFT

VERSION 1.0

Submitted by:



April 19, 1999

C. Test Results: Live CLEC Functional Evaluation (POP3)

1.0 Description

The "Live CLEC" Functional Evaluation test process provided an alternate test method through the use of live CLEC orders for those pre-ordering, ordering and provisioning processes that require long elapsed times or facilities that are not practical to provide in a test bed environment. Therefore, this test was designed in part to be complementary to the transaction functional tests (POP1, POP2 and POP5) to include transaction types that were not possible to include in these tests. In addition, this test allowed for an element of blind testing and tracking performance in a "real world" environment. Therefore, also included in the test was a review of typical pre-order queries and orders which were also part of the POP1, POP2 and POP5 tests in an effort to assess potential bias in the transaction tests.

A number of CLECs were solicited for participation in the test. An attempt was made to identify CLECs that order a wide variety of Resale and UNE products to assure that a complete set of the types of services offered by BA-NY were tested.. The list of CLECs that participated is provided later in this report. The KPMG test team worked with the CLECs to choose specific transactions that would best meet the objectives as stated above and that were most important to the individual CLECs.

In an attempt to incorporate the Web GUI, EDI, and manual processes in the test the KPMG test team used the following procedure. First, the team worked with the CLECs to determine and assess their internal processes. The team then observed live orders or pre-order queries initiated by the CLECs of the types included in the test. The team also audited any measurements that were performed by the CLECs on the transactions to assure that an accurate measurement of BA-NY performance was made. To capture a more complete set of metrics, in some instances the team suggested that alternative or additional measurements of BA-NY's service be made by the CLECs. Once the test team was assured that appropriate and accurate measurements were made, both recent historical and concurrent data on transactions including these measurements was incorporated into the test data to be analyzed. Because in many cases statistically relevant data was impractical to collect, the team conducted focussed interviews with CLEC operations personnel to capture CLEC experiences with BA-NY's OSSs and processes.

2.0 Methodology

The CLEC Live Functional Evaluation Team began by identifying the types of CLEC tests which would best illustrate the current state of pre-order, order and provisioning services being processed through the BA-NY Operation Support Systems (OSSs). Particular emphasis was placed on tests that would provide data on those ordering and provisioning transactions that require long elapsed times or



facilities. Also emphasized were tests that would provide data that would supplement or validate the results of transactions performed in the POP1, POP2, and POP5 testing efforts. The Live CLEC Functional Evaluation Team developed Test Targets for these tests and then Test Processes to collect the CLEC data. Test Criteria were refined to provide the KPMG testing team with a baseline to help determine the level of compliance that BA-NY demonstrates to the CLECs with regard to the particular Test Target(s).

Next, the Live CLEC Functional Evaluation Team worked with the CLECs directly. In an effort to ensure that reliable, consistent and focussed test data would be collected from the CLECs, the KPMG team adopted the following process with each CLEC that participated in this study:

- The KPMG Team sent invitation to active NY CLECs and Resellers soliciting participation in the CLEC live testing initiative.
- CLECs volunteering for participation in CLEC live testing initiative were contacted by the KPMG team leader and an introductory meeting date was scheduled.
- The KPMG team developed an introductory meeting agenda for each CLEC which were customized based on CLEC's presence and activities in the NY marketplace. Agendas included time dedicated to focussed interviews and exploratory discussions with CLEC operations personnel and service representatives, observations of transactions occurring in order processing centers and review of historical data collection methods. These agendas were distributed to CLECs prior to the introductory meeting to ensure that each CLEC had sufficient preparation time.
- At the introductory meeting, the KPMG team presented an overview of the project and of the KPMG testing objectives for live CLECs. CLEC concerns with the level of service being provided by the BA-NY Operation Support Systems (OSSs) were also identified.
- In many cases, follow-up meetings were held with CLECs in order to conduct focussed interviews with CLEC operations staff, collect additional information or to clarify information previously collected.
- Qualitative and quantitative analysis was performed using information and data collected from CLECs. Where applicable, statistics were developed and findings were drawn¹. During the process, the KPMG team realized that

¹ As a condition of providing KPMG with raw pre-order, order, and provisioning data, several CLECs required KPMG to sign non-disclosure agreements which in some cases included giving the CLEC the right to review any findings drawn from the CLEC data. In an effort to preserve anonymity, CLECs who provided data requested that the raw data would not be disclosed in any format other than a summarized format. Furthermore several CLECs requested that their summarized data not be presented in a standalone fashion



2.6 References

The reference material for this test includes the documents that were developed by the test team as well as documents collected from CLECs in support of the testing activities. These references are listed in the table below.

Table IV-3.2: References for POP3

Reference	Filename	Location in Work Papers
Pre-Filing Statement of BA-NY , dated April 6, 1998	hardcopy	POP3-C-8 Affidavits
Letter to Daniel M. Martin – New York State Department of Public Service, Re: AT&T/BA-NY Hot Cut Data Reconciliation, dated February 5, 1999.	hardcopy	POP3 -C-8 Affidavits
MCI Pre-Order Issues List	hardcopy	POP3-A-Pre-Order
AT&T, Allegiance – Collocation Installation Log	hardcopy	POP3-A-Collocation
Community – EDI interface development issues log	hardcopy	POP3-A-EDI
Allegiance, AT&T, MCI – LSC data collection	hardcopy	POP3-A-LSC
Allegiance, AT&T, MCI – Directory Services data collection	hardcopy	POP3-A-Directory Services
AT&T, MCI, KPMG Pseudo CLEC – Coordinated Hot Cut Test	hardcopy	POP3-A-Coordinated Hot Cut
CLEC Meeting Log	hardcopy	POP3-A-General

3.0 Results Summary

3.1 Results and Analysis

The results of this test are presented in the table shown below. This evaluation produced four types of results:

- Satisfied – the evaluation indicates that the specified criterion is met;
- Satisfied, exception resolved – the evaluation originally identified an exception, but was resolved in a satisfactory manner;
- Satisfied, with qualifications – the evaluation indicates that the specified criterion is met, although specific qualifications are noted; or
- Not Satisfied – the evaluation indicates that the specified criterion is not met

This table summarizes the evaluation criteria, the associated test cross reference, the test result and supporting comments.

Table IV-3.3: POP3 Evaluation Criteria and Test Results Matrix

Test Cross Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
P3-01	BA-NY has a well-defined, documented and understandable process for establishing manual transaction capabilities with CLECs	Satisfied	CLECs acknowledge that BA-NY provides a process for establishing manual transaction capabilities.
P3-02	BA-NY has a well-defined, documented and understandable process for establishing Web GUI transaction capabilities with CLECs	Satisfied	CLECs acknowledge that BA-NY provides a process for establishing Web-GUI based transaction capabilities.
P3-03	BA-NY has a well-defined, documented and understandable process for establishing EDI transaction capabilities with CLECs	Satisfied, with qualifications	CLECs building to the BA-NY EDI Interface have found the Business Rules Documents ¹ contain instances of inaccurate information and at times are in conflict with the BA-NY EDI User's Guides. It should be noted that several CLECs have indicated that the latest version (1.5) of the Order Business Rules has corrected many of the documentation errors.
P3-04	Manual transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation	Satisfied	CLECs acknowledge that BA-NY accepts manual transactions during there regularly scheduled hours of operation.
P3-05	Web GUI transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation	Satisfied, with qualifications	CLECs have indicated that on occasion the Web GUI is unavailable during the day. However no root cause analysis was ever performed to establish the cause of the outage.
P3-06	EDI transaction capability is consistently available during scheduled hours of operation	Insufficient data	CLECs have insufficient experience with the BA-NY EDI Ordering System to assess the availability of the system.
P3-07	Web GUI provides CLEC with sufficient functionality to	Satisfied, with	CLECs claim that because of technical and operational shortcomings of the

¹ For Pre-Order see – Bell Atlantic Pre-Order Format and Business Rules Guide and for Order see– Bell Atlantic Mechanized Specifications for Local Service Request



Test Cross Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	perform transaction set	qualifications	<p>Web-based GUI, it is still not practical to perform transactions in any volume because of the inherent inefficiencies of navigating through the GUI screens. The excessive end-to-end transaction time is attributed to multiple manual entries of several different fields, lack of up front edits and lack of scalability. CLECs find that it is not feasible to integrate the Web GUI with any other OSS and so must maintain two sets of computer terminals at each service representative's desk.</p> <p>CLECs have demonstrated that to check on the status of an order via the Web GUI, the status inquiry must be sent using the same system log-on ID that was used in the originally sent order. Since a different Web GUI log-on ID is usually distributed to each CLEC service representative, this effectively prohibits any service representative from checking the status of any order except those orders that the service representative personally sent. This presents a problem when CLEC service representatives go on vacation or are otherwise not available. This contributes to the CLECs' claim that the Web GUI is not practical for sending large volumes of orders.</p>
P3-08	Documentation supplied by BA-NY is sufficient to create transaction	Satisfied, with qualifications	<p>CLECs have demonstrated that documentation explaining rules about performing the Address Validation / TN selection is prone to error. Specifically rules associated with populating "SERVICE ADDRESS LOCALITY" (i.e.: city or town) are inconsistent depending on the city or borough of the end user. Furthermore rules for populating "SATH" (Service Address Thoroughfare, i.e.: Street, St, St., Drive, Dr, etc) are inconsistent depending on the city or borough of the end user. These rules are not documented. As a result of these</p>



Test Cross Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			undocumented rules, CLECs performing these transactions must resort to a process of trial and error, which is cumbersome and inefficient.
P3-09	BA-NY system or representative provides required transaction functionality	Not Satisfied	<p>With regard to supplements of Hot Cut orders, CLECs have demonstrated that on frequent occasions even though a supplement requested that the order be cancelled, BA-NY still processed the Hot Cut order on the originally specified day. This causes a disruption of the subscriber's service.</p> <p>With regard to cancellations of LNP Hot Cuts, CLECs have shown that on frequent occasions even though a cancellation request was submitted prior to the due date of the original order, the Hot Cut was still performed.</p> <p>It should be noted that BA-NY is instituting a new process designed to expand the level of testing and coordination extended to Hot Cut orders. KPMG analysts have reviewed this process and concur that, if followed by BA-NY resources in the RCCC, TISOC and individual Wire Centers, the quality of the LNP hot cut provisioning attempts should improve. (See Appendix E, Exception ID #54)</p>
P3-10	BA-NY system or representative provides response in agreed upon timeframe	Satisfied, with qualifications	<p>CLECs have demonstrated that LSCs are frequently received beyond committed response dates. This problem is exacerbated by BA-NY generating multiple LSCs upon receipt of a given CLEC service order. Exception Number 28 addresses this non-conformance and has not as yet been resolved.</p> <p>CLECs have demonstrated that CMPs are frequently received beyond committed response dates.</p>
P3-11	BA-NY system or representative provides accurate response	Not Satisfied	CLECs have demonstrated that Local Service Confirmations (LSCs) contain inaccurate information. Inaccuracies

Test Cross Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>include missing, incomplete or wrong BA-NY order numbers; ECCKT numbers; TNs, Cable Ids; etc. Inaccuracies in any of these LSC fields could prevent a CLEC from submitting a trouble report for the ordered service. Exception Number 42 was created to address this non-conformance and has not as yet been resolved.</p> <p>CLECs have demonstrated that multiple LSCs (at times as many as 20 or more) are frequently received against a single order, most of which provide no additional useful information.</p> <p>CLECs have demonstrated that "Due Date Availability" responses are "systematically erratic" i.e.: the GUI "Smarts Clock" system frequently categorizes every Tuesday in a several month period with a red designation which signifies "Date Not Available". (See Appendix E, Exception #28 and #42)</p>
P3-12	BA-NY system provides clear, accurate and relevant error messages	Satisfied, with qualifications	CLECs claim that the error messages returned from BA-NY are not standardized and difficult to interpret.
P3-13	Data elements comprising transaction requests or responses are usable for subsequent processing	Not Satisfied	<p>With regard to the Web GUI, CLECs have demonstrated that identical data elements used in GUI requests and responses can not be integrated with each other or with other down-stream systems a CLEC may implement.</p> <p>With regard to the EDI ordering, CLECs have indicated that, because BA-NY EDI Pre-Order and Order systems have different allowable values and formats for the same field type, integrating these two systems is overly complex.</p> <p>(See POP5 Results and Analysis, P5-25 through P5-29)</p>
P3-14	BA's Wholesale service to the CLECs is consistent with BA's Wholesale service to BA's	Not Satisfied	CLECs have demonstrated that BA-NY frequently fails to publish a Directory Listing as specified in UNE loop

Test Cross Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
	Retail organization		<p>migration orders for a significant percentage of orders of this type. It is suspected that this is experienced because of the way UNE loop migrations are ordered (as a combination of a disconnect order and a connect order) and processed by BA's downstream systems.</p> <p>CLECs claim that the LNP Hot Cuts are the source of most of their difficulties. (See Appendix E, Exception #54)</p>
P3-15	BA-NY Help Desk is accessible and responsive during scheduled hours of operation.	Satisfied, with qualifications	<p>CLECs attempting to access the BA-NY Help Desk indicate they experience excessive hold time.</p> <p>Since several CLECs have operations centers in different time zones and schedule the majority of their Hot Cut orders outside of normal business hours, CLECs are dissatisfied with the limited scheduled hours of availability of BA-NY Subject Matter Experts.</p> <p>CLECs attempting to request help during EDI interface development activities claim that knowledgeable BA-NY resources are difficult to access.</p>
P3-16	BA-NY Help Desk provides clear, accurate and timely responses to CLEC trouble resolution requests	Satisfied, with qualifications	CLECs indicate that BA-NY trouble resolution "call backs" to CLECs are frequently beyond committed response time.
P3-17	BA-NY Help Desk provides meaningful order entry technical support to CLEC order entry questions	Satisfied, with qualifications	CLECs indicate that representatives staffing BA's Help Desk frequently are unable to provide cogent answers about order entry questions.
P3-18	BA-NY provides well-defined and documented escalation procedures	Satisfied	CLECs acknowledge that escalation procedures have been established with BA-NY.
P3-19	BA-NY complies with its own escalation procedures	Satisfied	CLECs acknowledge that BA-NY complies with its escalation procedures.
P3-20	BA-NY provides order confirmation within required timeframe	Not Satisfied	CLECs have demonstrated that valid LSCs are frequently received beyond the committed interval. In addition, it is common practice for CLECs to receive multiple LSCs in response to a single order. These additional LSCs

Test Cross Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			<p>sometimes update information contained in prior LSCs and sometimes they are identical to prior LSCs.</p> <p>Because of this issue of multiple LSCs, the metric associated with this measure is ambiguous. The metric could be interpreted as "receipt of a confirmation to order within committed interval" or as "receipt of final correct confirmation of order within committed interval". This latter interpretation is more appropriate since confirmations containing invalid information are not useful and potentially misleading to CLECs.</p> <p>(See Appendix E, Exception ID#28)</p>
P3-21	BA-NY commits to provisioning dates identified in valid CLEC due date requests (e.g., a due date selected in accordance with the product's standard interval or if appropriate has been selected from the "Smarts Clock" application)	Satisfied, with qualifications	CLECs have demonstrated that some of their orders were rejected (SEMed) by BA-NY even though the due date interval was set in accordance with the product's standard interval or if appropriate has been selected from the "Smarts Clock" application.
P3-22	BA-NY performs provisioning activities in accordance with timeframes identified on its order confirmation	Not Satisfied	<p>With regard to provisioning Hot Cut Orders, CLECs have demonstrated that BA-NY technicians processing switch translations disconnects and Main Distribution Frame (MDF) rewiring are not performing their activities in a synchronized manner at the requested Frame Due Time of the order and performs some portion of cut either late or early. This has the potential to disrupt the service of the new CLEC customer for a period of time that can be from hours to days. Exception Number __ was created to address this non-conformance and have not as of yet been resolved.</p> <p>It should be noted that BA-NY is instituting a new process designed to expand the level of testing and coordination extended to Hot Cut</p>



Test Cross Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Comments
			Orders. KPMG analysts have reviewed this process and concur that if followed by BA-NY resources in the RCCC, TISOC and individual Wire Centers that the quality of the LNP provisioning attempts should improve. (See Appendix E, Exception #54)
P3-23	During joint planning and coordination activities, BA-NY provides knowledgeable and capable personnel to support CLECs	Satisfied, with qualifications	CLECs indicate that qualified BA-NY Engineering Staffs are difficult to access for support of complex orders.
P3-24	BA-NY consistently performs coordinated provisioning preparation work in a timely and effective manner	Not Satisfied	With regard to <u>provisioning of Hot Cut Orders</u> , CLECs have demonstrated that BA-NY systematically does not follow their prescribed process of performing tests on affected facilities before and during the Hot Cut. Because these processes are not followed, provisioning problems that could have been corrected are not identified until the customer is out of service. Such identifiable problems include: subscribers served by Integrated SLCs ¹ , lack of continuity in intra-office facilities between the MDF and the CLEC's collocation, lack of dial tone from the CLEC's switch, and the wrong pair on the MDF being wired to the CLEC collocation. Should any of these problems exist at the time of the Hot Cut, the customer's service will be disrupted. (See Appendix E, Exception ID #44 and ID #54)
P3-25	BA-NY provides jeopardy notices when appropriate in a timely manner in compliance	Not Satisfied	CLECs indicate that they do not currently receive jeopardy notices.

¹ Bell Atlantic utilizes Integrated Subscriber Loop Carrier (SLC) transmission technology to serve some of its customers. Any customer served by SLC wishing to migrate to a CLEC must first be transitioned off of the SLC onto spare copper facilities. This transition takes time for BA-NY to accomplish and is not practical to be done at the time of the Hot Cut. As a result, served by SLC Hot Cuts performed on customers served by SLCs must be aborted, occasionally the abort does not occur in time to prevent BA-NY from processing the Disconnect order in which case the customer will be taken out of service for a period of time.

